1	JAMES P. CUSICK (ADMITTED PRO HAC VICE	·)
2	ROBERT P. VARIAN (State Bar No. 107459) REBECCA F. LUBENS (State Bar No. 240683)	,
	ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP	
3	The Orrick Building 405 Howard Street	
4	San Francisco, CA 94105-2669	
5	Telephone: (415) 773-5700 Facsimile: (415) 773-5759	
6	Emails: jcusick@orrick.com rvarian@orrick.com	
	rlubens@orrick.com	
7	MICHAEL C. TU (State Bar No. 186793)	
8	TEODORA E. MANOLOVA (State Bar No. 233 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP	3333)
9	777 South Figueroa Street, Suite 3200	
10	Los Angeles, CA 90017-5855 Telephone: (213) 629-2020	
11	Facsimile: (213) 612-2499  Emails: mtu@orrick.com	
12	tmanolova@orrick.com	
	Attorneys for Defendants	1 P.
13	Morgan Stanley & Co. Incorporated, Merrill Lyr Fenner & Smith Incorporated, Jefferies & Comp	any, Inc.,
14	Cowen & Company, LLC and ThinkPanmure, Lknown as ThinkEquity Partners LLC	
15	known as ThinkEquity Lateners Elec	
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
18	OAKLAND DIVISION	
19		
20	In re BIGBAND NETWORKS, INC. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Master File No. 07-cv-5101-SBA
21		<u>CLASS ACTION</u>
22	This Document Relates To:	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
23	ALL ACTIONS.	UNDERWRITER DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT
24		Date: December 9, 2008
25		Time: 1:00 p.m.
26		Judge: Hon. Saundra B. Armstrong Ctrm: 3, 3rd Floor
27		
28		[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING HADERWRY

1	Defendants Morgan Stanley & Co. Incorporated, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith	
2	Incorporated, Jefferies & Company, Inc., Cowen & Company, LLC and ThinkPanmure, LLC	
3	(formerly known as ThinkEquity Partners LLC) (collectively, the "Underwriter Defendants")	
4	brought a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Consolidated Class Action Complaint for Violation of	
5	Securities Laws (the "Complaint") before this Court. After considering the pleadings, the papers	
6	submitted by the parties, and the oral argument of counsel, and good cause appearing therefore, th	
7	Court hereby orders that the Underwriter Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is granted.	
8	Specifically, the Court grants the Underwriter Defendants' Motion to Dismiss in its entirety	
9	for failure to state a claim pursuant to Rules 8, 9(b) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil	
10	Procedure. Plaintiffs' Complaint fails to plead facts sufficient to establish that the Prospectus	
11	contained statements that were either materially false, or rendered materially misleading by virtue	
12	of an omission. 15 U.S.C. §§ 77k(a) & 77l(a)(2). The Court finds that plaintiffs' allegations sound	
13	in fraud and fail to satisfy the heightened requirements of Rule 9(b). See, e.g., In re Stac Elecs.	
14	Sec. Litig., 89 F.3d 1399, 1405 (9th Cir. 1996). Irrespective of the application of Rule 9(b), the	
15	Complaint is also deficient under Rule 8 and the Supreme Court's decision in Bell Atlantic Corp. v	
16	Twombly, 127 S. Ct. 1955 (2007) and its progeny. See, e.g., Belodoff v. Netlist, Inc., 2008 WL	
17	2356699, at *12 (C.D. Cal. May 30, 2008). All claims based on forward-looking statements are	
18	nonactionable under the "bespeak caution" doctrine and fail for the additional reason that the	
19	Prospectus cautioned investors against the very risks that form the basis of plaintiffs' allegations.	
20	See, e.g., In re Worlds of Wonder Sec. Litig., 35 F.3d 1407, 1414 (9th Cir. 1994). Finally,	
21	plaintiffs' Section 12 claim fails as a matter of law because the Complaint fails to plead facts that	
22	would confer standing on the Lead Plaintiff, and his certification filed pursuant to the Private	
23	Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 conclusively demonstrates the absence of standing under	
24	Section 12. See Gustafson v. Alloyd Co., Inc., 513 U.S. 561, 577-78 (1995); In re Levi Strauss &	
25	Co. Sec. Litig., 527 F. Supp. 2d 965, 983 (N.D. Cal. 2007).	
26	//	
27	//	

28